

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 8 are canceled.

Claims 9 through 20 are pending in the case.

Claims 9, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 13, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 10 through 12, 17, 18 and 20 are objected to.

Discussion of Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Examiner has rejected claims 9, 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 6,421,624 B1 (Nakayama). Applicant has amended independent claims 9 and 16 to emphasize clear distinctions over Nakayama. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as to the claims as amended.

Below, Applicant points out subject matter within each independent claim that is not disclosed or suggested by Nakayama. On the basis of this, Applicant believes the independent claims discussed below and all the claims dependent thereon are patentable over Nakayama.

Discussion of Independent Claim 9

Claim 9 sets out a calibration module for connection between a device under test and a network analyzer. The calibration module includes a controller, a memory and a multi-state circuit.

Examiner has asserted that controller 28 in network analyzer 310, shown in Figure 15 of Nagayama, is equivalent to the controller set out in

Applicant's claim 9. However, the controller 28 shown by Nagayama is a controller within a network analyzer. Nagayama does not disclose or suggest a controller within a calibration module for connection between a device under test and a network analyzer, as set out in Applicant's claim 9.

Examiner has not made any attempt to show where the memory set out in claim 9 of the present case is disclosed or suggested by Nagayama.

Examiner has asserted that the first port, the second port and the third port of the multi-state circuit are disclosed by Nagayama by ports P1, P2, and P3 of network analyzer 100 (sub 2). However all the ports in Nagayama are in the network analyzer 100 (sub 2). None of these ports are within a calibration module for connection between a device under test and a network analyzer, as set out in Applicant's claim 9.

Further, as set out in claim 9, the second port is for connection to the network analyzer. However, in Nagayama, ports P1, P2, and P3 of network are all for connection to a DUT.

Discussion of Independent Claim 16

Claim 16 sets out a multi-state circuit for use within a calibration module. The calibration module is for connection between a device under test and a network analyzer. The multi-state circuit includes a first port, a second port, a third port, a first switch, a second switch and a third switch.

Examiner has asserted that the first port, the second port and the third port of the multi-state circuit are disclosed by Nagayama by ports P1, P2, and

P3 of network analyzer 100 (sub 2). However all the ports in Nagayama are in the network analyzer 100 (sub 2). None of these ports are within a calibration module for connection between a device under test and a network analyzer, as set out in Applicant's claim 16.

Further, as set out in claim 16, the second port is for connection to the network analyzer. However, in Nagayama, ports P1, P2, and P3 of network are all for connection to a DUT.

Discussion of Dependent Claim 14

Claim 14 is patentable over Nagayama based, at least, on the patentability of underlying independent claim 9.

Discussion of Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Discussion of Dependent Claims 13 and 19

Examiner has rejected claims 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,421,624 B1 (Nakayama) in view of USPN 6,826,506 B2 (Adamian). Claims 13 and 19 are patentable over the cited art based, at least, on the patentability of respective underlying independent claims 9 and 16.

Discussion of Dependent Claim 15

Examiner has rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,421,624 B1 (Nakayama) in view of USPN 6,300,775

B1(Peach). Claim 15 is patentable over the cited art based, at least, on the patentability of underlying independent claim 9.

Discussion of Objected to Claims

Examiner has objected to claims 10 through 12, 17, 18 and 20, but indicated these would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has so amended claims 10 through 12, 17, 18 and 20, so that claims 10 and claim 20 are in independent form, claims 11 and 12 depend on claim 10 and claims 17 and 18 depend on claim 20.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this Amendment has placed the present Application in condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
STANLEY EDWARD JAFFE

By 
Douglas L. Weller
Reg. No. 30,506

June 7, 2005
Santa Clara, California
(408) 985-0642